

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Yuuki et al. (US 6,108,063).

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Takahashi (JP 5-249422).

Claims 6 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 10, 14, and 19 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are pending for further consideration.

Applicant submits concurrently herewith eight (8) sheets of replacement drawings in a Submission of Replacement Drawings.

**Drawing Objections**

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that “the steps of cleaning/eliminating the exposed surfaces must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings. In the Replacement Drawings, FIG. 5H has been amended by adding additional arrows and the label “CLEANING/ETCH” to signify that the upper, side, and lower

exposed surfaces of the upper and lower substrates 28 and 18 are subject to cleaning/etching.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the features of the claims are shown in the drawings, and respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 6 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that use of the terms TEFLON® and CYTOP® are trademarks, thereby rendering the claims indefinite. Accordingly, Applicant has substituted the trademarked name TEFLON® with fluorinated polymer and CYTOP® has been removed in both of claims 6 and 19.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 19 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Yuuki et al. (US 6,108,063), and claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Takahashi (JP 5-249422). Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 14, as amended, all recite, in part, steps of “cleaning exposed surfaces of the bonded upper and lower substrates to remove an impurity thereon” and “simultaneously eliminating the exposed surfaces of the bonded upper and lower substrates.” In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Yuuki et al. discloses (col. 4, lines 36-62) etching a first glass substrate 1 using a resist film on a second substrate to prevent the second glass substrate 2 from being etched, and then etching the second glass substrate 2 for “reducing a total weight of the glass substrates” (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 2). Similarly, Takahashi discloses (Abstract) outside surfaces of one of the two substrates 11, 12 is etched to reduce the thickness of the substrate.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Yuuki et al. nor Takahashi teach or suggest a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display panel including steps of “cleaning exposed surfaces of the bonded upper and lower substrates to remove an impurity thereon” and “simultaneously eliminating the exposed surfaces of the bonded upper and lower substrates,” as recited by amended independent claims 1, 10, and 14, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-20.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-21 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applies references, whether taken alone or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: January 30, 2004

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 739-3000